



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

It would be like Sannazaro to soften down *alio tramite* into *alio flumine*; but Propertius did not scruple to translate Leonidas'

καὶ εἰ πετεῖνὰ διώκων  
ἰξεύτης ἦκεις τοῦθ' ὑπὸ δισσὸν ὄρος —A. P. ix. 337.

by

et si forte meo tramite quaeris avem —III. xiii. 44.

For the matter of sense, just as *alio tramite* suits *habitare*, so *pelle sitim* is a natural enough sequel to *siccis medullis*; paleographically, one must suppose either that *sitim* was perverted into *situo*, and then *si* excised as meaningless; or that *si* accidentally disappeared by puncture or erasure. The phrase *pellere sitim* is defended by Stat. *Theb.* v. 1: *postquam pulsa sitis*. In suggesting, then, that Propertius wrote

quod superest alio tramite pelle sitim

I am aware that large postulates are necessary—grave damage to the archetype, and stupid patching by copyists: for *puella* can only be accounted for as an aftergrowth upon *puer*, error upon error. But there are places, even in authors whose texts rest on sound tradition, that call for fire and steel.

Sannazaro's elegy<sup>1</sup> must have been composed before 1501, for he writes not as an exile himself. But what manuscript of Propertius may he have worked upon?

J. S. PHILLIMORE

GLASGOW  
February 2, 1909

### ΚΛΟΤΟΠΕΥΕΙΝ

νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα χάρμης  
αἰψα μάλ'. οὐ γὰρ χρὴ κλοτοπεύειν ἐνθάδ' ἔντας  
οὐδὲ διατρίβειν· ἔτι γὰρ μέγα ἔργον ἀρεκτον.

—Hom. T. 148 ff.

It is unnecessary to refer to the ancient and modern attempts to explain this word, since nothing satisfactory has been offered. I suggest *χρὴ (ἐ)κλοτυπεύειν*.

Let us first consider the form. We get by this change, instead of a monstrosity for which no plausible etymology can be suggested, a good epic word; for, though the compound in *ἐκ-* is not used by Homer, it is found in Hesiod *Sc.* 44. The change was produced by a metathesis of *τ* and *λ*, and *κλοτυπεύειν* was further changed to *κλοτοπεύειν* through the analogy of *ἡπερ-οπεύειν*. The association with *ἡπεροπεύειν* is confirmed by

<sup>1</sup> The edition I quote from is by Peter Horst, Coloniae MDCCCLXXXVII.

Hesychius' κλοτοπεντής· ἀλαζών, though a supposed connection with κλέπτω also had influence in suggesting this interpretation. It is more probable that the variant κλυτοπείν arose from the desire to replace the unknown κλοτ- by the familiar κλυτ-, than that it came directly from 'κτολυπείν by metathesis of το and λυ. The crasis χρή 'κτολυπείν is, of course, unusual, and it comes in the middle of the verse; yet for this we have a perfect parallel in the Πηλείδη θέλ' of A 277, which can be removed only by substituting the un-Homeric θέλω for θέλω. The crasis in A 277 is more difficult than the one assumed because of the natural pause after a vocative, whereas in our line the double diaeresis after the first and fourth feet renders the lack of the usual pause less marked. It is likely that the crasis was effective in retaining the corrupted form. Other striking cases of crasis in the Homeric text are μὴ ἄλλοι δ 165, ὦ ἀρίγνωτε ρ 375, ἀσβέστω· οὐδ' P 89, νιέ ἐμῷ ὤκυμόρῳ Σ 458. In comparison with any of these the absorption of an ε in a preceding η is simple.

As to the meaning, what reason can there be for defending ἐκτολυπείν here, when in the two passages in which this word occurs (Hes. Sc. 44 and Aesch. Agam. 1032) it means *achieve* and takes an accusative, while here it cannot mean *achieve* and has no object? In the first place it may be pointed out that διατελεῖν with the accusative also means *achieve*, yet it is frequently used without an object, but with a supplementary participle, like the ἐνθάδ' ἔοντας in this line. διαπλέκειν, the metaphorical use of which closely resembles that of τολυπείν, is used with a word of time, expressed or understood, meaning *to live*. διατρίβειν, with or without χρόνον means *to pass the time*, and διατρίβειν in our passage, with its natural suggestion of χρόνον, is co-ordinate with ἐκτολυπείν. The commonest object of διατελεῖν, when it takes an accusative, is a word of time; and, when it takes a participle, words of time may be expressed or understood; cf. τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ζόης διατελεῖν τυφλὸν ἔοντα (Hdt. vi. 117). A similar use of ἐκτολυπείν, in its sense of *complete*, would be natural.

The question also arises, whether there is any reason to believe that ἐκτολυπείν had so completely lost its original color as must be assumed, if it is the correct reading here. τολυπείν means properly *to make a ball*; so, with τολύπην, in Aristoph. Lys. 587. In οἱ δὲ γάμον σπείδουσι, ἐγὼ δὲ δόλους τολυπέω (τ 137), we have a metaphorical use of τολυπείν similar to δόλους πλέκειν or υφαίνειν; cf. πένθος τολυπέειν Eur. Rhes. 744. There is in the present tense of τολυπείν no derived idea of *completion*, such as has often been assigned to it. It is a verb of durative action, and in the present tense the end of the action is not in view. δόλους τολυπέω is *I wind away at wiles*, and in τ 137 the contrast with σπείδουσι suggests that emphasis is laid upon the slowness of the action, the growth of a ball in winding being very gradual. The aorist tense, on the other hand, looks to the completion of the action, and like our *wound up, rounded off*, ἐτολύπευσα very naturally implies *I completed*. Thus in the Odyssean

phrase ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσε (α 238, δ 490, ξ 368, ω 95) the meaning is *after he had got through the war*. Here there is no such metaphorical meaning as in δόλους τολυπύω. The subject of the verb is not the *weaver* or *contriver* of the war; he is not even the one who *brought to an end* the war; he is simply one who has *been through* the war *to the end*. Though the aorist of τολυπύω naturally implies *completion*, in the phrase ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσε the word was selected for the sake of the sound-play. We should read ἐπεὶ πτόλεμον (cf. Ω 7, 8) τολύπευσε,<sup>1</sup> for the repetition, τολ—τολ, is evidently intentional, and the three π's add to the effect. In Ξ 85 ff.—οἷσιν ἄρα Ζεὺς ἐκ νεότητος ἔδωκε καὶ ἐς γῆρας τολυπεύειν ἀργαλέους πολέμους—neither the aorist meaning *complete*, nor the natural metaphorical use, seen in δόλους τολυπύω, is admissible. The meaning is nothing more than a weakened *be engaged in*. Whether the simple verb had really lost its original color to this extent, or whether in Ξ 86 we have merely an echo of the familiar Odyssean phrase, our material does not allow us to decide. But if the simple verb had reached this stage, the meaning I am assuming for the compound is easily intelligible.

The compound ἐκτολυπεύειν does not mean, as has often been supposed, *to unwind*. ἐκ- here has its frequent idea of completeness. It gives to the durative verb the same terminative effect as we have found in the aorist. Hence there has naturally developed the meaning *to achieve, complete*, and the literal meaning of the simple verb has been weakened or entirely lost. Neither in Hes. *Sc.* 44 nor in Aesch. *Agam.* 1032 can it be positively asserted that the idea of *winding* is present at all. It would be as natural, then, to use ἐκτολυπεύειν with a word of time as διαπλέκειν or διατελείν, and as natural to omit that word, especially in connection with διατρίβειν, and have a supplementary participle. The meaning thus given to our passage, *we ought not to stay on here and waste time*, is perfectly satisfactory. While many have sought in κλοτοπεύειν some such sense as *to waste time in talk*, others have suspected a resemblance in meaning to διατρίβειν (cf. Faesi). It is common enough for the word following οὐδέ to repeat and emphasize what precedes: cf. οὐ τις ἐδυνήσατο ποιμένα λαὸν οὐτάσαι οὐδὲ βαλεῖν Ξ 424.

A. G. LAIRD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

<sup>1</sup>In six out of seven instances in Homer τολυπεύειν is used with πόλεμον (the seventh is δόλους τολυπύω, where there is also a sound-play). The same pun is used in Aristoph. *Lys.* 587 f.:

οὐκουν δεινὸν ταυτὶ ταύτας ραβδίσειν καὶ τολυπεύειν,  
αἷς οὐδὲ μετῆν πάνν τοῦ π(τ)ολέμου;

Without the pun the connection is none of the clearest. Recognizing it, we may translate, "What a shame it is for these women to be making these rolls, who are not on the regimental rolls at all."